

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500310044-8

SECRECY IN HEARINGS ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the refusal of the Secretary of State to appear Monday in open session before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the foreign aid program should tell Congress, the American people, and the world a great deal about the nature of the American aid program and the purposes to which it is being put.

His insistence upon secrecy in initiating the aid debate reflects the growing furtive and stealthy character of bilateral aid as a tool and weapon of American foreign policy. There once was a time when the great bulk of aid, even military, was fully covered in open hearings with the Secretary of State, with only a few questions in sensitive areas reserved for executive session. In 1966, we have reached the stage where he will not present the foreign aid program in public session, but seeks to reverse the normal procedure by offering the possibility that he may come back later for an open hearing. Up to now, it has been customary for a leading cabinet officer to present the opening testimony on a foreign policy matter in public and leave to a future closed session the relatively few matters of a security nature. Why the change?

"Beware," I say to foreign governments; "beware of American aid that the American people are not told about by their Government. Beware of foreign aid that is discussed behind locked doors the same way the CIA budget is discussed behind locked doors, for you may never know what is being done for you and what is being done to you under such a program."

This particular foreign aid program was unveiled with considerable fanfare about its new emphasis upon education and food production. It was a hopeful sign to some of us who have believed that foreign aid was becoming little more than wallpaper over the cracks and breaks in the social and economic structure of recipient countries, countries that must develop their human and natural resources first, if ever they are to have a foundation on which to build a growing standard of living.

In the last decade, foreign aid to developing countries has conformed to an economic theory that we abandoned in this country over 30 years ago—the trickle-down theory of economic growth. We have sent American commodities abroad under the aid program on the belief that if we put enough wealth into the upper crust of the society, some would trickle down to the masses below, providing at least a modicum of improvement in their lot. But I am frankly of the opinion that Herbert Hoover economics are not going to do any more for the less developed nations than they did for a depression-ridden America.

If we assigned every cent of the \$917 million program for military aid to education instead, we would do more for the people of the world in 1 year than we will do under 20 years of the current program. Of course, many of the governments of countries we are aiding do not want that kind of assistance. The American aid program has been designed more to maintain the status quo than to bring about change. It is usually suits both sides of the aid transaction.

In fact, American economic and military aid—particularly military aid—has supported military juntas around the world. It has been used by tyrants around the world to stamp out freedom.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me say that the shocking record of the United States by way of military aid in South America has been a record of the stifling of freedom in many parts of Latin America, the Dominican Republic being the latest.

Oh, if the American people could only get the facts about foreign aid. If the American people could get the facts about their foreign aid, they would hold the Johnson administration to a political accounting, as it should be.

The Johnson administration now has a Secretary of State who wants to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations in a secret session. Again, the senior Senator from Oregon forewarns the American people, as he has been doing for 21 years in this body, to watch out for government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy. The Johnson administration is galloping toward government by executive supremacy and government by secrecy, and this is its latest ride.

These are some of the issues that should be explored this year in considering this authorization. We should examine into the nature and the extent of this new emphasis upon basic resource and human development, for we should know whether it is merely a public relations device, or a real change in the emphasis of the program.

Now the Secretary of State takes position that he cannot discuss foreign aid in public in his opening presentation. That tells me almost as much as hearing what he has to say. He has already answered many of the questions I would have asked him in public about what we are really seeking to do with foreign aid.

I shall not be in attendance for his private explanation of the secretive, clandestine nature of the aid program. I will not help to dignify the concealment policy of the Secretary of State by becoming a party to it.

I can read; and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I shall, in due time, read the Secretary's secret testimony, so that when the committee reaches the point of marking up the bill, I can offer amendments this year, as I have done in the past, seeking to check this Secretary of State, who is doing such irreparable harm to the history of this Republic. But I shall not dignify his testimony by lending my ears to hear it.

Moreover, I shall have much more fruitful endeavors in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where we are hearing in open and public session about the education needs of present and future generations of Americans; and what we can do about them.

In fact, I was willing to postpone the hearings of the Subcommittee on Education scheduled for Monday if the Secretary of State had been willing, in a public hearing, to talk about the foreign policy that belongs to the American people, not to the Secretary of State. But in view of the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations has mistakenly ac-

ceeded to the Secretary's insistence that he appear only in executive session, I not only shall not be present, but shall proceed with the public hearings on education.

So far as the Senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, and speaking as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, there never would have been any hearings on foreign aid this year if they had to be held under the dictates of the Secretary of State in secret session. I would have let him sit in the Department of State and twiddle his thumbs. I would have given him no hearings, unless he were willing to conform to what I think is a precious guarantee in a democracy, a guarantee which the American people are entitled to have the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate, and Congress protect.

I say to the American people from this desk today, as I have said to them in the past: "Do not forget that in a democracy there can be no substitute for a full disclosure of the public's business. Foreign policy belongs to you, not to Lyndon B. Johnson, to Dean Rusk, or to McNamara. It belongs to you, the people. The only check you have left is the check of your ballots. Start using your ballots to vote out of office those in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government who are willing to conduct foreign policy as it is now being conducted; a policy that will kill thousands upon thousands of American boys in Asia in the years immediately ahead, if this President and his Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense are not checked."

It does not make me happy to find myself in such unalterable, irreconcilable disagreement with my President in regard to the killing operation that is taking place in South Vietnam. That killing must be stopped; and the killing will not be stopped by the kind of foreign aid bill we can be sure this administration will offer. It will not be stopped until Congress begins to exercise the check that the constitutional fathers wrote into the Constitution—the check of the purse strings.

I say to Congress that not until we make it very clear to this President that we are not going to vote the money for the escalating of the war in Vietnam and the killing, each week, of additional numbers of American boys, shall we avoid what I am satisfied will be, eventually, a war that will lead into China and will bog us down in Asia for decades to come.

Oh, I know that war hysteria is stalking the Nation.

Those who raise their voices, as I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate again this afternoon, must expect to be castigated and attacked and smeared with the statement that they will some way, somehow let down the boys in South Vietnam.

My answer is that there only happen to be a small number of us who are seeking to protect those boys in South Vietnam. By denying to the President the power to escalate this war and by denying to him the funds, we will force him to fall back on a position such as a General Gavin, General Ridgeway, George Kennan, and a good many other authorities in this country are urging upon this administration.

Mr. President, this voice will not be silenced short of a declaration of war, and this Senator will not support the

kind of foreign aid program, let me assure everyone, that Dean Rusk will testify for in secrecy on Monday.

I shall continue to say to the American people, "It is up to you. You now must exercise the greatest right of freedom that our constitutional fathers gave you, your right of the ballot." In my judgment, if that right is not exercised, and if we do not stop this trend toward government by secrecy and executive supremacy, then it is doubtful that we will leave a heritage of freedom to our grandchildren. Because if we are moving into world war III, there will be no freedom for future generations of American boys and girls.

One of my sadnesses these days is to face what I think irrefutable, that not many in the Congress of the United States, or, for that matter, not enough people in the country, are thinking in terms of the kind of a legacy we are going to leave American boys and girls 50 to 100 years from now. Let me say that we will leave them no legacy of freedom if our generation is responsible for leading the world into the third world war. And a continuation of this administration's foreign policy in Asia, in my judgment, assures a war with China, and from that we will go into world war III.